

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1685

OLLYE TINE SNOW REYNOLDS; BOBBY O. REYNOLDS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS; FAIRFAX COUNTY
SCHOOL BOARD; ROBERT SPILLANE, Former Superin-
tendent; ALAN LEIS, Former Director of Person-
nel then Deputy Superintendent, now Interim;
LOUDOUN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS; MANASSAS CITY
PUBLIC SCHOOLS; FALLS CHURCH CITY PUBLIC
SCHOOLS; ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District
Judge; Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Magistrate Judge. (CA-98-1077-A)

Submitted: October 14, 1999

Decided: November 5, 1999

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ollye Tine Snow Reynolds, Bobby O. Reynolds, Appellants Pro Se. Ingo Frank Burghardt, HUNTON & WILLIAMS, McLean, Virginia; Richard Mark Dare, HAZEL & THOMAS, P.C., Falls Church, Virginia; Martin Ritchie Crim, SMITH & DAVENPORT, Manassas, Virginia; Francis Joseph Prior, Jr., SICILIANO, ELLIS, DYER & BOCCAROSSE; Carol Winfield McCoskrie, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Arlington, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Ollye Tine Snow Reynolds and Bobby Reynolds appeal from the district court's orders dismissing this civil action and denying the motion for reconsideration and other post-judgment motions. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Reynolds v. Fairfax County Pub. Sch. Sys., No. CA-98-1077-A (E.D. Va. July 24, Sept. 27, Sept. 28, Oct. 14, Oct. 27, Dec. 19, Dec. 29, 1998 & Jan. 5, Jan. 11, Jan. 22, Feb. 1, Feb. 2, Feb. 9, Feb. 26, Mar. 19, Apr. 13, and Apr. 26, 1999). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process. The motions to defer consideration of the appeal and for a restraining order are denied.

AFFIRMED